

REMARKS**Claim Changes**

Claim 1 is amended to more clearly recite the claimed invention. No new matter is added.

Rejection of claims 1-9, 11-15, 17, and 22-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Office Action rejected claims 1-9, 11-15, 17, and 22-31 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicant respectfully submits that “provisioning information,” “first decryption information,” “first content,” and “second decryption information” as recited by the claims are adequately described in paragraphs [11], [43], [12], and [33] of Applicant’s specification. For example, Applicant’s paragraph [43] recites “the digital receiver... sending provisioning information... the provisioning information includes a unit key, unique serial number and certificate.” Applicant’s paragraph [12] recites “RMM [first decryption information] sent to each of the provisioned receivers.... The RMM has an expiration date and a category key used to decrypt revocation control messages (RCM) [second decryption information].” Applicant’s paragraph [33] recites “a content service is a channel of video or audio programming or on-demand video service.”

Further, “first method” and “first content” are called so in view of dependent claim 2 which recites “a second content using a second method... wherein at least one of an algorithm, a key and a key length of the second method is different from that of the first method.” See Applicant’s paragraph [12], line 14. Applicant respectfully

submits that “cryptographically secured” is adequately described in paragraph [12] of Applicant’s specification. Applicant’s paragraph [12] recites “only the digital receivers that have a current RMM [first decryption information] to decrypt the RCM [second decryption information] can get the content key.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims 1-9, 11-15, 17, and 22-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

The Office Action rejected claims 1-9, 11-15, 17, and 22-31 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant’s specification provides support for “encrypting the content encryption key using the first decryption information, the first decryption information being generated using the provisioning information.” Applicant’s paragraph [27] recites “a unit key is taken from the provisioning information by... content broadcasters. An RMM [first decryption information] is created by each content broadcaster.” Applicant’s paragraph [12] recites “the RMM [first decryption information] has... a category key used to decrypt revocation control messages (RCM) ... RCM that has a content [encryption] key to decrypt program or channel.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1-9, 11-15, 17, and 22-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over US 2002/0090090 (Van) in view of US 5703950 (Jovanovich)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-9, 11-15, 17, and 22-31. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Van and Jovanovich does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations as set forth in independent claims 1,

11, 12, 17, and 22. For example, independent claims 1, 11, 12, and 17 recite “receiving/sending provisioning information from [a] subset of the population of digital receivers” and claim 22 recites “provisioning information that is sent away from the content receiver” which are not taught or suggested in the combination of Van and Jovanovich.

Jovanovich is directed to a technology for controlling allocation of country specific frequencies within an RF device. The technology is implemented by providing a secure communication system for transmitting frequency information between a host computer and a remote unit. The remote unit transmits a unique identifier code (Device ID) to the host computer. The Device ID is an alphanumeric code that is unique for the remote unit. After verifying the authenticity of the Device ID, the host computer encrypts the frequency information using an encryption algorithm with the Device ID as an encryption key. The encrypted frequency information is transmitted to the remote unit. The remote device then decrypts the received frequency information using its device ID as a decryption key. See Jovanovich, col. 4, lines 20-45 and Abstract.

Applicant’s claims 1, 11, 12, and 17 recite “sending/receiving provisioning information from [a] subset of the population of digital receivers” and claim 22 recites “provisioning information that is sent away from the content receiver.” According to Applicant’s specification on paragraph [11], [43], the provisioning information includes a unique serial number, a unit key and a certificate. Applicant’s provisioning information is provided to a receiver during a provisioning process by a network. See Applicant’s specification, page 12, paragraph [47]. In contrast, Jovanovich’s Device ID is an alphanumeric code assigned to the host unit. See Jovanovich, col. 4, lines 20-

22. Jovanovich fails to disclose Applicant's provisioning information provided to the remote unit during a provisioning process.

Further, Applicant agrees with the Office Action's contention on page 6 of the Office Action dated November 28, 2007, that "Van does not expressly disclose receiving provisioning information from a subset of the population of digital receivers."

For the above reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1, 11, 12, 17, and 22 are not obvious in view of the combination of Van and Jovanovich, and therefore that the rejection of claims 1, 11, 12, 17, and 22 under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn. Applicant requests that claims 1, 11, 12, 17, and 22 now be passed to allowance.

Dependent claims 2-9 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 1. Dependent claims 13-15 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 12. Dependent claims 23-31 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 22. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claims 2-9, 13-15, and 23-31 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

To the extent an extension of time is needed for consideration of this response, Applicant hereby request such extension and, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account number 502117 for any fees associated therewith.

Dated: May 28, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Larry T. Cullen/

Larry T. Cullen
Registration No.: 44,489

Motorola Connected Home Solutions
101 Tournament Drive
Horsham, PA 19044
(215) 323-1907